

**Mr. Harvie Andre (Calgary Centre):** Mr. Speaker, as other speakers on this side of the House have indicated, we recognize the necessity for a bill of this kind at this time. It would be folly again to neglect or try to ignore the fact that our offshore supplies are insecure. It is amazing the number of times that lesson has been brought home to this government, but what has it done about security of supply for Canada? Since at least 1950 the Independent Petroleum Association of Canada—that is, small Canadian-owned companies, some not so small, and their association—has been making representations to this government and its predecessors indicating that Canada should become self-sufficient in oil and gas and that Canada should not rely on imported oil and gas. All these representations were to no avail, in spite of Middle East developments.

I suppose the best example of just how wrong this government can be is in the document entitled "An Energy Policy for Canada" published in July of 1973, in which the government stated:

To date, the security threat has not appeared serious enough to require arrangements to be made to supply the area east of the Ottawa Valley with western Canadian crude oil.

That gem of advice from the yahoos opposite who are supposed to be looking after our energy supplies was given three months before the OPEC embargo when there were shortages offshore. Having had the OPEC warning and the warning with regard to Iran's political upheaval, I hope we will not have to go through this exercise again and that this government will finally pursue policies which will result in Canada's being self-sufficient, as we have indicated should have been done for a number of years.

When he does take this bill to the committee I expect that the minister will permit witnesses from the provinces, and amendments. Considering the frequency with which this government has been saying it wants to co-operate with the provinces, and considering that in 1974 and 1975 there were disputes between the federal government and the producing provinces, it is incredible to me that the minister would bring this bill forward without having consulted the producing provinces. There has been no consultation at all. One could be forgiven for thinking that the government might be deliberately trying to start another battle in anticipation of some short-term political gain, without any concern for the long-term damage which might be done to the country.

During this debate a number of speakers opposite have raised the Petro-Canada question and, in the process, made many statements which are just plain untrue. I would like to deal with a few of those. The minister said that Petro-Canada has caused a considerable increase in exploration and development. The fact is that Petro-Canada has not drilled a single well for either gas or oil in Canada, and if the minister does not believe me, I suggest he check the Calgary newspapers of a couple of weeks ago. If he does, he will see the president of Petro-Canada quoted as admitting that Petro-Canada has yet to drill a single well.

What has Petro-Canada done? The minister said that Chairman Hua of mainland China wanted to deal with Petro-

### *Energy Supplies*

Canada. What poppycock! Chairman Hua was quite prepared to deal with Coca-Cola, and if he is prepared to deal with Coca-Cola, I am sure he would be prepared to deal with PanCanadian, Home, Dome, Ranger, Anderson Exploration, or with a dozen other Canadian-owned oil companies which would be prepared to go to China next week to engage in exploration activities. The minister expects us to believe that Chairman Hua said, "Please bring us Petro-Canada; we don't care that it has not drilled anywhere in the world." Absurd!

Then the minister went on to say that without Petro-Canada we would not be negotiating with Norway. What I want to know is why we are negotiating with Norway. I thought our aim was to try to secure oil supplies for Canada. I did not know we were interested in Norway's security of supply. I thought we were interested in Canada's security of supply.

**Mr. Gillespie:** You have the blinkers on.

**Mr. Andre:** Can somebody explain to me how drilling in the North Sea with Norway's state-owned oil company is going to bring about security of supply for Canada? I am afraid that one escapes me.

I would like to deal with the remarks of the Leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. Broadbent) a little more seriously, because they were made seriously. I may disagree with the position taken by the New Democratic Party, but that party is much more honest in its position than the group opposite. Members of the New Democratic Party do not claim to be something and then do something else. The Leader of the New Democratic Party made a statement to the effect that we should welcome a state-owned oil company because every country in the world has one. Let us look at the situation. The four strongest economies in the world are those of the United States, Germany, Japan and Switzerland. Not one of those countries has a national oil company.

**Mr. Gillespie:** Oh, really?

**Mr. Andre:** Let us look at the level just below that, at countries such as France, Belgium and the United Kingdom. None of those countries have significant oil companies.

**An hon. Member:** What about BP?

**Mr. Andre:** BP has been mentioned. I will mention others. Fina of Belgium and Total and Aquitaine of France are not Crown corporations as we know them. They are corporations in which the state has a significant ownership position. I am sure hon. members would appreciate the difference. They are not agents of the state. They operate in the market place. The state happens to be a shareholder, and that is quite different. If the minister thinks there is no difference, then he must feel that CDC Oil and Gas is exactly the same as Petro-Canada. Does he believe that CDC Oil and Gas, of which the Government of Canada owns 50 per cent, is the same as Petro-Canada, or was he aware of this? Probably not.